



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/680,107	10/04/2000	Glenn Reid	004860.P2476	8211

7590 09/19/2005

Lisa Benado
Blakely Sokoloff Taylor & Zafman LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

EXAMINER

WANG, JIN CHENG

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2672

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2005

14

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/680,107

Applicant(s)

REID, GLENN

Examiner

Jin-Cheng Wang

Art Unit

2672

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Reopen Prosecution after Board Decision

Prosecution on the merits of this application is reopened on claims 1-26 considered unpatentable for the reasons indicated below: a search of the prior art not being cited in the previous prosecutions indicated that claims 1-26 are not allowable and therefore a new ground of rejection to the claims is presented in the present Office Action. As set forth below, the claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Scott U.S. Patent No. 5,638,504.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Scott U.S. Patent No. 5,638,504 (hereinafter Scott).

1. Re Claims 1, 8, 15, 21:

Scott teaches a method of manipulating a presentation of a time based stream of information in a processing system, the method comprising:

A) Adding an edit feature to the presentation to create a revised presentation in response to a user edit command (e.g., In Fig. 8, Scott discloses a function block 400 where the document presenter is retrieved from the stored document and then a call is made on the

Art Unit: 2672

document presenter object to create a window presenting the document's contents at function block 410 and a facility 430 for displaying and **editing the stored document's content data**; see column 15, lines 2-12), and

B) Creating a proxy of the revised presentation and displaying the proxy during the adding (In Fig. 8, Scott discloses creating a proxy at 440 in which the proxy element in conjunction with the window containing it is an object that implements the direct user manipulations and the proxy is created and displayed during the user direction manipulations; see also column 15, lines 15-20; Note that the proxy of a revised presentation is continuously updated in response to the adding of the edit features and therefore the presentation is a "time based stream of information").

Moreover, Scott discloses in column 16, lines 11-36 that the proxy or the window containing and presenting the proxy, on behalf of the proxy assumes the role of a drop acceptor (or the drop accepting entity as described in Fig. 9 and column 15, lines 30-67). Therefore, the drop acceptor is also a proxy which is being presented. Scott describes in Fig. 9 and column 15, lines 30-67 dragging the proxy to another drop-accepting entity or proxy to create a new presentation or a proxy of the revised presentation while being presented in the window during the dragging and dropping user manipulations (during the adding of the proxy to the drop acceptor or another proxy to create a revised presentation as represented by the drop acceptor proxy). Scott discloses in column 16, lines 11-36 dragging an item from an external source to the existing proxy presentation to create a new proxy or a proxy for the revised presentation with the

new edit feature of the item from an external source which is being dragged and dropped into the window containing and presenting the proxy.

For example, a printer object is opened in the workspace, then it becomes an icon (proxy) to which you can drag documents to have an associated hardware printer device print a document. If the printer object is opened to a window with a proxy, the printer object may opens into a window that shows the state of queued jobs, the state of the printer or a control panel for special printer functions. Including a proxy in the window allows the user to continue to use the same interface for dragging a job to the printer, namely by dragging a document icon to the proxy icon and the proxy icon is a representation of the revised presentation that has been continuously updated (column 17, lines 20-32).

Re Claims 2, 9, 16, 22:

The claims recite additional claimed limitation of displaying units of the presentation in response to the user edit command and sending instructions for creating the proxy when a unit requiring modification is reached. However, Scott further discloses the claimed limitation by disclosing display windows containing and presenting the proxy on behalf of the proxy in response to the user edit manipulation or drag and drop manipulations and sending instructions for creating the proxy (see functional block 440 of Fig. 8 wherein a proxy is created during user manipulations of the editing (see column 15-16).

Re Claims 3, 10, 17, 23:

The claims recite additional limitation of creating proxy by drawing an imitation of the edit feature. However, Scott further discloses the claimed limitation by disclosing creating proxy

Art Unit: 2672

in the functional block 440 during user manipulations of the editing and creating a proxy of the revised presentation during user's dragging and dropping operations in which other proxies or items from an external source can be dragged and dropped into the proxy or the window containing and presenting the proxy on behalf of the proxy assuming the role of a drop acceptor (column 15-16) and thus discloses creating the proxy of the revised presentation by drawing an imitation of the edit feature by drag and drop operations.

Re Claims 4, 11, 18, 24:

The claims recite additional claimed limitation of the edit feature being text and the imitation including simulated character, size and font. However, Scott further discloses dragging and dropping an edit feature such as another proxy with a reference to the stored document and the stored document is text or dragging and dropping an item from an external source wherein the item is text (Fig. 9 and column 15-16) or editing directly on a document and creating and displaying the proxy of the document during the editing of the document's content (see Fig. 8 and column 15).

Re Claims 5, 12 and 25:

The claim 5 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 1 except additional claimed limitation of a first software component having instructions for adding the edit feature and the first software component being separate from a second software component that has instructions for creating the proxy. However, Scott discloses in Fig. 8 separate functional blocks for adding the edit feature in function block 430 and for creating the proxy in function block 440.

Re Claims 6, 13, 19 and 25:

The claim 6 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 5 except additional claimed limitation of the second software unit being a plug-in or ActiveX control. However, Scott discloses a plug-in function block 440 for creating a proxy (Fig. 8) in addition to the other function blocks.

Re Claims 7, 14, 20 and 26:

The claim 7 encompasses the same scope of invention as that of claim 1 except additional claimed limitation of displaying of the proxy at a rate that is substantially less than the play rate of the time-based stream of information. However, Scott also discloses displaying the proxy as a graphical icon which is displayed at a rate that is substantially less than the play rate of the window for presenting the document information (column 15-16).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1,8, 15 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Phillips U.S. Patent No. 6,504,552 (hereinafter Phillips).

2. Re Claims 1, 8, 15, 21:

Phillips teaches a method of manipulating a presentation of a time based stream of information in a processing system, the method comprising:

A) Adding an edit feature to the presentation to create a revised presentation in response to a user edit command (e.g., Phillips discloses adding the special effects to a low resolution video 335 in response to a user edit command; column 9, lines 5-20 and 14, lines 10-20), and

B) Creating a proxy of the revised presentation and displaying the proxy during the adding (Phillips discloses rendering special effects on a low resolution video frame and the modified low resolution video frame is a proxy of the revised presentation because it has the new special effects being added into it. Phillips discloses editing special effects on a frame of video image 335 generated/created by the compositor 330 or rendering the special effects on a frame of low resolution video images 424 generated by DNLE 420 so that artist 120 can view the special effects displayed in images 424 to determine if the rendering is satisfactory and such editing of the special effects are viewed and displayed on a low resolution image frame which is a proxy of high resolution image frame. Phillips discloses that the artist 120 recreates the special effects by viewing low-resolution video proxy images 335 and translation of the renderings of artist 120 with reference to video proxy images 335 and the compositor 330 uses data to generate high-resolution images with special effects; the rendering of the low resolution image frame or proxy of the revised presentation with the special effects being added is performed during the editing of the special effects and the displaying of the low resolution image frame or proxy of the revised presentation with the special effects being added is performed during the editing of the special effects; see column 11, lines 60-67, column 12, lines 1-26 and column 14, lines 10-20).


Conclusion


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jin-Cheng Wang whose telephone number is (571) 272-7665. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 - 6:30 (Mon-Thu).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mike Razavi can be reached on (571) 272-7664. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

jcw


MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600


Acting Director